

REMARKS

New Claims 16-18 have been added. Claims 9-18 are pending with Claims 9 and 11 being independent. For the reasons set forth below, Applicants believe that the rejections should be withdrawn and that the claims are in condition for allowance.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 9-15 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claims 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,463,534 to Geiger et al. ("Geiger") in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0116271 to Mankoff et al. ("Mankoff"). Applicants traverse this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Claim 9

According to one embodiment of the service providing system of Claim 9, ticket information for an event, such as a concert or an exhibition, can be downloaded from an information providing server to a portable terminal and stored in the portable terminal together with authentication information which specifically identifies the information providing server and can not be edited by the portable terminal. Because the authentication information that specifically identifies the information providing server is displayed on the portable terminal and can not be edited, the authenticity of the information for the ticket displayed by the portable terminal can be more reliably verified, which makes it possible to dispense with paper tickets. *See* page 2, line 7 to page 3, line 10 of the specification.

The Examiner admitted that Geiger fails to explicitly teach a second display area which displays only the authentication information and authentication information that can not be edited by the portable terminal. However, the Examiner asserted that the use and advantages for displaying such information is well-known to one skilled in the art as evidenced by the teachings of Mankoff. The Examiner asserted that Mankoff teaches displaying an unalterable digital image/code/watermark. Although Mankoff discloses electronic or virtual coupons available on web pages that can be downloaded to a mobile device, Mankoff does not disclose a portable terminal having a second display area which displays only the authentication information which specifically identifies the information

providing server and authentication information that can not be edited by the portable terminal.

The PDA of Mankoff does not contain a second display area that displays only the authentication information which specifically identifies the information providing server. *See* Figs. 3 and 4. Neither the PDA 60 nor the virtual coupon 40 of Mankoff is the second display area of Claim 9.

The Examiner asserted that paragraphs 30-32 of Mankoff teaches a PDA displaying an unalterable digital image/code/watermark. However, the term “unalterable” in paragraph 32 of Mankoff describes the “digital image.” *See* [0032]. The relevant sentence in its entirety states: “Thus, for example, the coupon may be downloaded (either to the PC or the PDA) as an unalterable digital image or with a verifying code (e.g., a digital watermark, a checksum, or the like).” [0032] ll. 4-7. Mankoff further describes the “coupon’s expiration date” as an example of an unalterable object. [0032] ll. 7-8. The “unalterable digital image” disclosed by Mankoff does not serve as authentication information that specifically identifies the information source (the information providing server), as required by the service providing system recited in Claim 9. Mankoff does not provide any details of how the “verifying code” is or could be used. Neither a digital watermark nor a checksum identifies an information providing server, as required by Claim 9.

Mankoff describes that it may be desirable to “associate a given identifier (e.g., a coupon serial number) with a given user (or user identifier, such as a cookie)” wherein “the given identifier may be associated with the given user when the user first downloads the coupon.” [0032] ll. 13-16. The “given identifier” is associated with a user, not an information source. Mankoff makes no mention of unalterable verifying codes, identifiers, or any sort of authentication information which specifically identifies the information providing server and that can not be edited by the portable terminal as required by Claim 9.

Mankoff does not teach or suggest a portable terminal having a second display area which displays only the authentication information which specifically identifies the information providing server or authentication information that can not be edited by the

portable terminal, as required by Claim 9. Accordingly, Claim 9 would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill from the cited references at the time Applicants made the claimed invention. Claim 9 is patentable over Geiger in view Mankoff.

Claim 11

Claim 11 includes similar limitations to Claim 9. For the reasons discussed above in support of patentability of Claim 9, the invention of Claim 11 also would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill from the cited references at the time Applicants made the claimed invention. Accordingly, Claim 11 is also patentable over Geiger in view of Mankoff.

Claims 10 and 12-15

Claims 10 and 12-15 depend from independent Claim 9 or 11. The remarks made above in support of patentability of the independent claims are equally applicable to distinguish the dependent claims from the cited references.

NEW CLAIMS

New Claims 16-18 have been added and are supported by the specification (*see e.g.*, page 3, line 5 to page 4, line 22; page 7, line 1-3 of the specification; and Fig. 6). Claims 16-18 further define various aspects of the service providing system and depend from Claim 9. Claim 16 recites “wherein the authentication information further comprises an IP address to uniquely identify a location of the information providing server on the network.” Neither Geiger nor Mankoff teach or suggest authenticating the source of requested information by displaying authentication information that includes a network address identifying the information providing server.

No new matter has been added. Accordingly, dependent Claims 16-18 are patentable over Geiger in view of Mankoff for at least the same reasons as the independent claims.

CONCLUSION

This application should now be in condition for allowance, and the Applicant solicits a notice to that effect. If there are any issues that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the undersigned at 404.685.6799. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be due or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-0855.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brenda O. Holmes , 40339/

By: Brenda O. Holmes
Reg. No. 40,339

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530
Telephone: (404) 815-6500
Facsimile: (404) 815-6555
Date: January 3, 2008